

[Submitting Counsel on Signature Page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: JUUL LABS, INC., MARKETING,
SALES PRACTICES, AND PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION

Case No. 19-md-02913-WHO

JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE STATEMENT AND PROPOSED AGENDA

This Document Relates to:

ALL ACTIONS

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-10(d) and the Court’s January 15, 2021 Minute Order (ECF No. 1277), counsel for Defendants Juul Labs, Inc. (“JLI”), Altria,¹ Director Defendants,² E-Liquid Defendants,³ Retailer Defendants,⁴ and Distributor Defendants⁵ (collectively “Defendants”), and Plaintiffs’ Co-Lead Counsel (“Plaintiffs”) (collectively referred to herein as

¹ “Altria” refers to Altria Group, Inc., and the Altria-affiliated entities named in Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Class Action Complaint and Consolidated Master Complaint (collectively, “Complaints”), *see* ECF Nos. 387, 388.

² “Director Defendants” refers to Messrs. James Monsees, Adam Bowen, Nicholas Pritzker, Hoyoung Huh, and Riaz Valani.

³ “E-Liquid Defendants” refers to Mother Murphy’s Labs, Inc., Alternative Ingredients, Inc., Tobacco Technology, Inc., and Eliquitech, Inc.

⁴ “Retailer Defendants” refers to Chevron Corporation, Circle K Stores, Inc., Speedway LLC, 7-Eleven, Inc., Walmart, and Walgreen Co.

⁵ “Distributor Defendants” refers to McLane Company, Inc., Eby-Brown Company, LLC, and Core-Mark Holding Company, Inc.

1 the "Parties") respectfully provide this Joint Case Management Statement in advance of the
 2 Further Case Management Conference scheduled for February 19, 2021.

3 **I. PARTICIPANT INFORMATION**

4 The conference will proceed via Zoom, and the Parties will not appear in person. Anyone
 5 who wishes to attend the conference must log in using the information available at:
 6 <https://www.cand.uscourts.gov/judges/orrick-william-h-who/>.

7 **II. ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED BELOW AND PROPOSED AGENDA**

8

1. Status of Case Filings and Dismissals
2. Case Management Matters
3. Discovery Status
4. ADR Status

12 **III. STATUS OF CASE FILINGS AND DISMISSALS**

13 As of February 15, 2020, 1789⁶ cases are pending in this MDL, naming 114 defendants. A
 14 list of these defendants is attached as **Exhibit A**. To date, 1593 personal injury cases and 163
 15 government entity cases (including 121 school districts, 20 counties, 2 cities, and 20 tribes) have
 16 been filed in this MDL. 252 MDL plaintiffs have voluntarily dismissed their cases (248 personal
 17 injury plaintiffs and 3 class plaintiffs and 1 school district); 147 cases have been dismissed
 18 without prejudice pursuant to CMO No. 8; and 45 other cases are subject to pending motions to
 19 dismiss without prejudice that have not yet been ruled upon.

20 There are 311 complaints pending in JCCP 5052, which is assigned to Judge Ann I. Jones
 21 of the Los Angeles Superior Court as the Coordination Trial Judge. There are 73 government
 22 entity cases, including 69 school districts and 236 personal injury cases brought on behalf of over
 23 2400 individual personal injury plaintiffs. There are 16 defendants named in those JCCP cases.

24 The Parties are also aware of 15 cases filed by State Attorneys General specifically:
 25 California, Illinois, Hawai'i, New York, North Carolina, Mississippi, Minnesota, Washington
 26 D.C., Arizona, Pennsylvania, New Mexico, Massachusetts, Colorado, Alaska and Washington.

27

28 ⁶ The numbers in this Statement reflect the Parties' good faith estimates based on reasonably
 available information. The Parties will continue to work together to align their data and resolve
 any inconsistencies.

1 Plaintiffs' Liaison Counsel continue their outreach to various State Attorneys General to discuss
 2 cooperation with this MDL.

3 An update on matters of significance (including hearings, schedules, deadlines,
 4 depositions, substantive orders, and trial dates) in Related Actions as defined by the Joint
 5 Coordination Order (CMO 9, ECF No. 572 at 1, 3), is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

6 **IV. CASE MANAGEMENT MATTERS**

7 **A. Personal Injury Actions**

8 **1. Dismissal Of Certain Defendants from Bellwether cases**

9 Plaintiffs have decided to dismiss with prejudice the Retailer Defendants⁷, the Distributor
 10 Defendants⁸, and the E-Liquid Defendants⁹ from the personal injury bellwether discovery pool
 11 cases, including cases that may be selected to replace any pending personal injury bellwether
 12 discovery pool case that has been or will be dismissed. Plaintiffs will promptly file a notice of
 13 dismissal pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(i) in order to dismiss the Retailer Defendants,
 14 the Distributor Defendants, and the E-Liquid Defendants from the pending personal injury
 15 bellwether discovery pool cases. Similarly, to the extent a new bellwether case is selected to
 16 replace a bellwether case that has been voluntarily dismissed, Plaintiffs shall file a notice of
 17 dismissal pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(i) dismissing any Retailer Defendants,
 18 Distributor Defendants, and E-Liquid Defendants named in such a case promptly.

19 Plaintiffs reached the decision to take this action because these defendants were brought
 20 into the case chronologically later, and thus discovery as to them is at an earlier stage and would
 21 not be complete in time to meet the schedule for the first round of bellwether cases. It is
 22 expressly agreed that Plaintiffs' dismissal of the Retailer Defendants, the Distributor Defendants,
 23 and the E-Liquid Defendants from the personal injury bellwether discovery pool cases does not
 24 extend to or impact any other case pending in this MDL in which the Retailer Defendants, the

25
 26 ⁷ Chevron Corporation, Circle K Stores Inc., Speedway LLC, 7-Eleven, Inc., Walmart, Inc. and
 27 Walgreen Co.
 28 ⁸ McLane Company, Inc., Eby-Brown Company, LLC, and Core-Mark Holding Company, Inc.
⁹ Mother Murphy's Laboratories, Inc., Alternative Ingredients, Inc., Tobacco Technology, Inc., and eLiquitech, Inc.

1 Distributor Defendants, or the E-Liquid Defendants are named as a party. It is further agreed
 2 their dismissal shall not be construed as an admission of non-liability or in any other adverse
 3 manner against Plaintiffs in any other pending case filed against these Defendants.

4 In light of Plaintiffs' dismissal, the Retailer Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and
 5 the E-Liquid Defendants will not be filing deferred pleading challenges in the personal injury
 6 discovery pool bellwether cases, because they will no longer be defendants in those actions.
 7 Plaintiffs and the Retailer Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and the E-Liquid Defendants
 8 will meet and confer regarding the appropriate timing and mechanisms for the Retailer
 9 Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and the E-Liquid Defendants to raise pleading challenges
 10 for the non-bellwether cases in which they are still named as defendants.

11 Plaintiffs and the Retailer Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and the E-Liquid
 12 Defendants will continue to coordinate with respect to discovery, although the Parties agree that
 13 nothing waives the ability of a party to object to discovery.¹⁰ Given the dismissals, Plaintiffs and
 14 the Retailer Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and the E-Liquid Defendants have agreed
 15 that the Retailer Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and the E-Liquid Defendants will not
 16 attend the Core Discovery depositions, as described in this Court's September 9, 2020 Order
 17 Regarding Bellwether Selection and Case/Trial Schedule (ECF No. 938 at 1-2), for each of the
 18 personal injury bellwether discovery pool cases or the depositions of any case specific experts
 19 who are identified in any individual personal injury bellwether discovery pool case. The Retailer
 20 Defendants', the Distributor Defendants', and the E-Liquid Defendants' rights to participate in all
 21 other depositions are unaffected. For example, the Retailer Defendants, the Distributor
 22 Defendants, and the E-Liquid Defendants will have the right to participate in all depositions of all
 23 defendants and third parties (other than third parties specific to a bellwether case).

24 In addition, given the impending dismissal, Plaintiffs on the one hand, and the Retailer
 25 Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and the E-Liquid Defendants on the other, stipulate that
 26

27 ¹⁰ The Retailer Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and the E-Liquid Defendants reserve all
 28 rights with respect to, among other things, objections on the basis of privilege, privacy, relevance,
 proportionality, burden, admissibility, or that the discovery sought is unreasonably cumulative
 and/or can be obtained from another more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive source.

1 the expert bellwether discovery deadlines identified in this Court's September 9, 2020 Order
 2 Regarding Bellwether Selection and Case/Trial Schedule (ECF No. 938) no longer apply to the
 3 Retailer Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and the E-Liquid Defendants. Plaintiffs and the
 4 Retailer Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and the E-Liquid Defendants shall continue to
 5 meet and confer with respect to appropriate timing for any expert discovery. Likewise, Plaintiffs
 6 on the one hand, and the Retailer Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and the E-Liquid
 7 Defendants on the other, stipulate that the other deadlines in the Court's September 9, 2020 Order
 8 Regarding Bellwether Selection and Case/Trial Schedule (ECF No. 938), including deadlines for
 9 motions for summary judgment, *Daubert* motions, the bellwether trial deadlines, and fact
 10 discovery do not apply to the Retailer Defendants, the Distributor Defendants, and the E-Liquid
 11 Defendants.

12 **2. The Bellwether Discovery Pool**

13 **Defendants' Position**

14 On December 15 and December 30, 2020, a 24-case personal injury bellwether discovery
 15 pool was selected, consisting of 12 randomly selected picks, 6 Plaintiffs picks; and 6 Defense
 16 picks. (See ECF Nos. 1188, 1212.) On January 19, 2021, Holly Potter, one of the Defense picks,
 17 voluntarily dismissed her case. (No. 3:19-cv-08261, ECF No. 7) Defendants proposed that they
 18 be allowed to strike one of the remaining 23 cases to level the discovery pool. However, based
 19 on timing of the dismissal, Defendants and Plaintiffs ultimately agreed that Defendants could
 20 select a replacement pick, which Defendants did. Subsequently, on February 4, 2021 yet another
 21 Defense pick, George Smigiel, voluntarily dismissed his claim (No. 3:20-cv-04259, ECF No. 8.)
 22 And on Feb. 9 and 10, 2021, two randomly-selected picks also dismissed their claims. (No. 3:20-
 23 cv-05983, ECF No. 9; No. 3:20-cv-04695, ECF No. 5.)

24 The BW Discovery Pool currently is comprised of 6 Plaintiffs picks; 5 Defense picks, and
 25 10 random picks. To rebalance the scales—and given the amount of work to be done—
 26 Defendants propose that they be allowed to strike one of Plaintiffs' 6 picks. This would result in
 27 total pool of 20 (5 Plaintiffs picks; 5 Defense picks; and 10 random picks). The Court should
 28 adopt this proposal for the following reasons.

1 **The Personal Injury Bellwether Pool Is Already Skewed:** All agree that selecting
 2 representative bellwether cases is the key to “producing reliable information” “on the strengths
 3 and weaknesses of various claims and defenses and the settlement value of cases.” (ECF No. 910
 4 at 22.)¹¹ Over Certain Defendants’ objections, the Court’s November 9, 2020 Order both (1)
 5 limited the bellwether discovery pool to those cases that had designated the Northern District of
 6 California as the trial forum, and (2) gave Plaintiffs an opportunity to amend their complaints to
 7 change their designated forum if they wished to do so. (See ECF No. 1125.) As Certain
 8 Defendants have previously explained, these decisions seriously compromised the potential
 9 representativeness of the pool across several dimensions. (See, e.g., ECF No. 1191 at 3–4.) The
 10 Court acknowledged Certain Defendants’ position at the December 18, 2020 Case Management
 11 Conference, but confirmed that it intends to stay the course to keep the case moving. (See
 12 12/18/2020 Hr’g Tr. at 5:4–14.) Certain Defendants continue to believe that the constraints on
 13 the bellwether selection process—made worse by the recent voluntary dismissals—results in a
 14 heavily skewed bellwether pool that will not provide reliable information necessary to facilitate
 15 the successful resolution of this MDL.

16 **Allowing Defendants To Strike One of Plaintiffs’ Picks Will Help Balance The Dropped**
 17 **Defense Pick:** While affording Defendants an additional strike would not cure the overarching
 18 problems with bellwether representativeness outlined above, it would help offset the impact of
 19 post-selection voluntary dismissals. As authorities recognize, “[r]epresentativeness should be
 20 maintained throughout the selection and trial process,” and MDL courts have discretion in that
 21 process. *See* Melissa J. Whitney, Federal Judicial Center, *Bellwether Trials in MDL Proceedings: A Guide for Transferee Judges* 14 (2019). And MDL courts have significant discretion to
 22 implement and adjust MDL procedures for fairness and efficiency. *See, e.g., In re*
 23 *Phenylpropanolamine Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 460 F.3d 1217, 1232 (9th Cir. 2006) (“[M]ultidistrict
 24 litigation is a special breed of complex litigation where the whole is bigger than the sum of its
 25

27 ¹¹ Quoting *Guidelines & Best Practices for Large & Mass-Tort MDLs*, Bolch Jud. Instit., Duke
 28 Law School, (2d ed. Sept. 2018) at 18; M. Whitney, Fed. Jud. Ctr., *Bellwether Trials in MDL Proceedings: A Guide for Transferee Judges* (May 15, 2019) at 3-4; *Manual for Complex Litig.* § 22.315 (4th ed. 2004).

1 parts. The district court needs to have broad discretion to administer the proceeding as a whole,
 2 which necessarily includes keeping the parts in line.”); *Dzik v. Bayer Corp.*, 846 F.3d 211, 216
 3 (7th Cir. 2017) (“District courts handling complex, multidistrict litigation ‘must be given wide
 4 latitude with regard to case management’ in order to achieve efficiency.”).

5 While “replacement of any cases that drop out of the pool” could be considered (Whitney,
 6 Federal Judicial Center at 14),¹² that is neither practical nor sufficient here. *First*, the parties are
 7 already strained in meeting the current schedule. Plaintiffs missed their original discovery
 8 response deadlines, and even after Defendants afforded extensions, the responses are neither
 9 complete and for some have not been submitted at all. The Parties have less than two months
 10 before core fact discovery closes and they will need to analyze and propose their trial candidates.
 11 *Second*, affording an additional early strike is appropriate given the unique procedures that
 12 cabined the pool from which random, defense, and plaintiffs’ picks for the discovery pool were
 13 selected—which itself reflected the Court’s willingness to modify procedures as it determined
 14 circumstances warranted. (See, e.g., ECF No. 1125.) *Third*, such modification is fair and
 15 appropriate here. Right now Plaintiffs’ picks out outnumber Defendants’ picks 6 to 5. This
 16 imbalance could be easily cured by allowing Defendants to strike one of Plaintiffs’ picks, and there
 17 would be no prejudice before additional bellwether discovery proceeds. (*Id.* at 2 (finding no
 18 prejudice because “[t]hese proceedings are still in their early stages, despite the significant motion
 19 and discovery practice to date”)).

20 **Plaintiffs’ Position**

21 With the bellwether selection process well underway and functioning as expected to
 22 identify representative cases for trial, Defendants once again seek to reduce the number of
 23 potential cases this Court can try. The parties proposed 24 cases—a large number—for the
 24 bellwether selection pool, anticipating that some plaintiffs would drop out for any number of

25 ¹² See also, e.g., Call for Public Comment, *Standards & Best Practices for Large & Mass-Tort MDLs*, Bolch Jud. Instit., Duke Law School, (Mar. 12, 2018) at 17 (“Although there may be good-faith reasons for settling or for voluntarily dismissing a test case, there could be instances in which the parties do so to manipulate the takeaways from the bellwether process.... Such strategic behavior can be mitigated by, for example, allowing plaintiffs to choose the replacement for any bellwether case that defendants choose to settle rather than take to trial, or allowing defendants to select the replacement for any bellwether case that plaintiffs choose to dismiss.”).

1 reasons, including the demands of being a bellwether plaintiff in the midst of the COVID
 2 pandemic. That some plaintiffs have opted not to proceed is not a defect in the process, but an
 3 important part of helping both sides grapple with the ground reality of these cases. *See Standards*
 4 *And Best Practices For Large And Mass-Tort MDLs*, Bolch Jud. Instit., Duke Law School
 5 (December 19, 2014) at 21 (“Many bellwether cases resolve along the way, whether because of
 6 errors in the plaintiff-fact sheet, special factors that strengthen or weaken the case during
 7 discovery that were not anticipated at the outset, or because of the court’s early rulings. These
 8 cases should not be regarded as failures. Instead, they are important data points, helping the
 9 lawyers better understand the ground reality of the cases — which may vary considerably from the
 10 hypothetical plaintiff that has been the idealized subject of early negotiations. Indeed, the reasons
 11 these cases drop out — gamesmanship, good advocacy, plaintiffs disappearing, the outcome of
 12 preliminary motions — all provide insights into how the broader pool of cases may fare. Yet,
 13 recognizing this, it is important that the judge select a larger pool of cases, knowing that they will
 14 resolve at a variety of points in the bellwether litigation process — as they should.”).

15 To the extent Defendants have concerns regarding bellwether pool Plaintiffs’ compliance
 16 with their discovery obligations, they should be bringing those issues promptly to Judge Corley
 17 for resolution. The parties have been meeting and conferring and working in good faith to narrow
 18 and resolve disputes, as set forth in the Joint Discovery Status Report, Exhibit C. Discovery of
 19 the bellwether pool has been extensive. Plaintiffs have provided eight authorizations releasing
 20 medical, mental health, employment, education, tax and other records, in addition to Plaintiff Fact
 21 Sheets. Last week, they responded to 20 interrogatories with 58 numbered subparts and up to 51
 22 Requests for Production. Within the next two months, each Plaintiff will sit for a deposition
 23 (along with their parent or friend and, if applicable, their physician). Additionally, per
 24 Defendants’ request, Plaintiffs are working with a vendor to search the following sources for
 25 responsive material, using agreed-upon search terms: (1) email accounts; (2) social media
 26 accounts/platforms (including messaging applications) (i.e., Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and
 27 Snapchat); and (3) any other websites where Plaintiffs made public postings. Plaintiffs’ counsel
 28 also agreed to ask Plaintiffs to manually review their phones and electronic devices for responsive

1 photos or videos. Plaintiffs have advised Defendants that privacy concerns have led several
 2 plaintiffs to withdraw from the bellwether process. Nevertheless, Defendants are seeking to add
 3 compulsory medical exams to the list of discovery to complete before bellwether selection. This
 4 issue will be heard on Tuesday, February 23 by Judge Corley.

5 Against this backdrop, Defendants' request to further diminish the bellwether pool is
 6 counter-productive. Under the Court's current process, Defendants will have an opportunity to
 7 argue why certain cases are or aren't representative, upon a more fulsome record, and after having
 8 a clearer picture of which plaintiffs will advance to trial. Removing another potential case from
 9 the pool now—particularly one in which the plaintiff has committed to proceed—would detract
 10 from, not promote resolution.

11

B. Class Actions

12

Plaintiffs request a modest extension of the class certification briefing schedule that,
 13 significantly, will not require an adjustment of the case schedule overall.

14

Plaintiffs' position

15

There is good cause for the class certification extension. The parties' document
 16 productions are still very much underway and depositions have only just begun, after months of
 17 negotiations over scheduling and scope. Plaintiffs' merits expert work necessarily must trail the
 18 development of the evidentiary record. Importantly for class certification, only two weeks ago JLI
 19 made its first productions of certain basic sales and cost information (*e.g.* financial reports
 20 showing profits and costs) that plaintiffs have been actively pursuing since last summer.¹³ And
 21 only in January did plaintiffs receive sales data broken out by state. The parties continue to meet
 22 and confer given that much of the requested sales, revenue, cost, and profit data was not
 23 maintained in the ordinary course of business throughout the relevant time period, and thus
 24 presents a variety of challenges. The Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of JLI's corporate designee on
 25 topics concerning sales and cost information was previously set for February 18-19, but had to be
 26 continued briefly because the witness, who is located in Austin, Texas, has been subjected to

27

¹³ ECF 1244 (Joint Discovery Status Report, 1/8/21) at 4-5.

1 adverse weather conditions this week. JLI also recently produced thousands of advertisements
 2 that ran during the class period, which will need to be reviewed and analyzed.

3 While any one of these considerations may not independently preclude plaintiffs from
 4 moving for class certification in March 2021 as currently scheduled, together they pose
 5 significant obstacles to plaintiffs' ability to complete key expert and discovery work to support
 6 their class certification motion. Rule 23 neither requires nor allows a "free-ranging merits
 7 inquiry" at the class certification stage. *Amgen Inc. v. Connecticut Ret. Plans and Trust Funds*,
 8 133 S.Ct. 1184, 1194-95 (2013). But, of course, at class certification plaintiffs must submit an
 9 evidentiary record showing that their claims are susceptible to classwide proof, and their theories
 10 of liability will be critiqued if they are not sufficiently tethered to their damage theories. *Comcast*
 11 *Corp. v. Behrend*, 133 S.Ct. 1426, 1432-33 (2013)).

12 Plaintiffs propose a six-week extension that would preserve the current intervals between
 13 briefing events and the hearing, and would result in class certification being heard in September
 14 (subject to this Court's availability), rather than August. Defendants object but provide no
 15 persuasive reason that an adjustment of the class certification schedule requires a wholesale
 16 adjustment of the case schedule. Class certification is undoubtedly an important milestone in the
 17 litigation, but certification briefing frequently occurs after the close of discovery and need not be
 18 resolved by the time summary judgment briefing begins. If any class is certified, plaintiffs intend
 19 to promptly implement a notice program designed to alleviate any potential concerns about
 20 substantive implications on the case schedule. Though JLI takes issue with Plaintiffs' recitation of
 21 the good cause basis for the extension, it was intended to reflect the iterative process the parties
 22 have undertaken, with Judge Corley's assistance,¹⁴ as to the relevant discovery.

23 To the extent Defendants believe an overall extension of the case schedule is necessary,
 24 Plaintiffs are prepared to engage, with the benefit of the Court's guidance. But for present

25 ¹⁴ By way of example: The sales data JLI produced in July 2020 (JLI01504764) provides
 26 nationwide net revenue figures; it did not provide the requested state-specific information or gross
 27 revenues. Plaintiffs requested clarification about many aspects of the data in September 2020
 28 (including how net revenues were calculated); they did not receive a substantive response until
 January 2021. While JLI is correct that it previously produced certain revenue, profit, and cost
 information, only certain responsive data and files were identified and/or produced for the first
 time this month. The parties continue to meet and confer.

1 purposes, there is no basis for Defendants to object to moving the class certification deadline if
 2 they intend to seek an extension of the entire case schedule. Plaintiffs see little reason to submit
 3 additional briefing regarding the requested class certification extension, but are prepared to do so
 4 if the Court deems it appropriate.

5 Plaintiffs' proposed adjustments to the class certification schedule are as follows:

6	Event	7 Current Date	8 New Proposed Date
9	Plaintiffs Serve Class Certification Expert Reports	10 March 17, 2021	11 April 28, 2021
12	Motion for Class Certification (as to California subclass, federal nationwide class, any other state(s) agreed or ordered to be included in first class bellwether trial(s))	13	14
15	Opposition to Motion for Class Certification	16 June 16, 2021	17 July 28, 2021
18	Defendants Serve Class Certification Response Reports	19	20
21	Defendants File <i>Daubert</i> Motions for Class Plaintiffs' Class Certification Experts	22	23
24	Reply in Support of Motion for Class Certification	25	26
27	Plaintiffs Serve Class Certification Rebuttal Reports	28	29
30	Class Plaintiffs File <i>Daubert</i> Motions for Defendants' Class Certification Experts	31	32
33	Class Plaintiffs File Oppositions to Defendants' <i>Daubert</i> Motions	34	35
36	Defendants file Oppositions to Class Plaintiffs' <i>Daubert</i> Motions	37	38
39	Hearing on Motion for Class Certification	40	41
42	43	44	45
46	47	48	49
50	51	52	53
54	55	56	57
58	59	60	61
62	63	64	65
66	67	68	69
70	71	72	73
74	75	76	77
78	79	80	81
82	83	84	85
86	87	88	89
90	91	92	93
94	95	96	97
98	99	100	101
102	103	104	105
106	107	108	109
110	111	112	113
114	115	116	117
118	119	120	121
122	123	124	125
126	127	128	129
130	131	132	133
134	135	136	137
138	139	140	141
142	143	144	145
146	147	148	149
150	151	152	153
154	155	156	157
158	159	160	161
162	163	164	165
166	167	168	169
170	171	172	173
174	175	176	177
178	179	180	181
182	183	184	185
186	187	188	189
190	191	192	193
194	195	196	197
198	199	200	201
202	203	204	205
206	207	208	209
210	211	212	213
214	215	216	217
218	219	220	221
222	223	224	225
226	227	228	229
230	231	232	233
234	235	236	237
238	239	240	241
242	243	244	245
246	247	248	249
250	251	252	253
254	255	256	257
258	259	260	261
262	263	264	265
266	267	268	269
270	271	272	273
274	275	276	277
278	279	280	281
282	283	284	285
286	287	288	289
290	291	292	293
294	295	296	297
298	299	300	301
302	303	304	305
306	307	308	309
310	311	312	313
314	315	316	317
318	319	320	321
322	323	324	325
326	327	328	329
330	331	332	333
334	335	336	337
338	339	340	341
342	343	344	345
346	347	348	349
350	351	352	353
354	355	356	357
358	359	360	361
362	363	364	365
366	367	368	369
370	371	372	373
374	375	376	377
378	379	380	381
382	383	384	385
386	387	388	389
390	391	392	393
394	395	396	397
398	399	400	401
402	403	404	405
406	407	408	409
410	411	412	413
414	415	416	417
418	419	420	421
422	423	424	425
426	427	428	429
430	431	432	433
434	435	436	437
438	439	440	441
442	443	444	445
446	447	448	449
450	451	452	453
454	455	456	457
458	459	460	461
462	463	464	465
466	467	468	469
470	471	472	473
474	475	476	477
478	479	480	481
482	483	484	485
486	487	488	489
490	491	492	493
494	495	496	497
498	499	500	501
502	503	504	505
506	507	508	509
510	511	512	513
514	515	516	517
518	519	520	521
522	523	524	525
526	527	528	529
530	531	532	533
534	535	536	537
538	539	540	541
542	543	544	545
546	547	548	549
550	551	552	553
554	555	556	557
558	559	560	561
562	563	564	565
566	567	568	569
570	571	572	573
574	575	576	577
578	579	580	581
582	583	584	585
586	587	588	589
590	591	592	593
594	595	596	597
598	599	600	601
602	603	604	605
606	607	608	609
610	611	612	613
614	615	616	617
618	619	620	621
622	623	624	625
626	627	628	629
630	631	632	633
634	635	636	637
638	639	640	641
642	643	644	645
646	647	648	649
650	651	652	653
654	655	656	657
658	659	660	661
662	663	664	665
666	667	668	669
670	671	672	673
674	675	676	677
678	679	680	681
682	683	684	685
686	687	688	689
690	691	692	693
694	695	696	697
698	699	700	701
702	703	704	705
706	707	708	709
710	711	712	713
714	715	716	717
718	719	720	721
722	723	724	725
726	727	728	729
730	731	732	733
734	735	736	737
738	739	740	741
742	743	744	745
746	747	748	749
750	751	752	753
754	755	756	757
758	759	760	761
762	763	764	765
766	767	768	769
770	771	772	773
774	775	776	777
778	779	780	781
782	783	784	785
786	787	788	789
790	791	792	793
794	795	796	797
798	799	800	801
802	803	804	805
806	807	808	809
810	811	812	813
814	815	816	817
818	819	820	821
822	823	824	825
826	827	828	829
830	831	832	833
834	835	836	837
838	839	840	841
842	843	844	845
846	847	848	849
850	851	852	853
854	855	856	857
858	859	860	861
862	863	864	865
866	867	868	869
870	871	872	873
874	875	876	877
878	879	880	881
882	883	884	885
886	887	888	889
890	891	892	893
894	895	896	897
898	899	900	901
902	903	904	905
906	907	908	909
910	911	912	913
914	915	916	917
918	919	920	921
922	923	924	925
926	927	928	929
930	931	932	933
934	935	936	937
938	939	940	941
942	943	944	945
946	947	948	949
950	951	952	953
954	955	956	957
958	959	960	961
962	963	964	965
966	967	968	969
970	971	972	973
974	975	976	977
978	979	980	981
982	983	984	985
986	987	988	989
990	991	992	993
994	995	996	997
998	999	1000	1001

1 letter briefs of not more than five pages each by next Friday, February 26, 2021. In advance of
 2 the conference, Defendants note the following for the Court's consideration.

3 *First*, Defendants do not oppose reasonable extensions of the case schedule, but do oppose
 4 a six-week extension of the class-certification motion schedule *in isolation* as neither fair nor
 5 sufficient. Six weeks does not address the fundamental problem—which is that Defendants have
 6 not been allowed sufficient time to take the discovery necessary to prepare these case for trial.
 7 However, if Plaintiffs are allotted six more weeks to file their motion for class certification, then
 8 the entire schedule should shift across the case types (personal injury, class, and government
 9 entity) and across the schedule to provide equitable relief to *all Parties*.¹⁵ Among other things,
 10 moving only the class-certification-motion schedule will force Defendants to file summary
 11 judgment motions six days after the hearing on class certification, and likely weeks before the
 12 certification motion is decided.

13 *Second*, Plaintiffs' suggestion that a class-motion-only reprieve is justified because
 14 "merits expert work necessarily must trail the development of the evidentiary record" does not
 15 advance their cause.¹⁶ Plaintiffs' schedule specifically contemplated that their certification
 16 motion and supporting expert reports would be served ***months before the*** completion of fact
 17 discovery. Plaintiffs purposefully "aligned" their proposed deadlines (which the Court largely
 18 adopted) to "bring fact discovery and class certification briefing to a close by the start of June of
 19 2021." (ECF No. 927 at 1; *see also* ECF No. 938.) Under Plaintiffs' new proposal, however, fact
 20 discovery would close in June of 2021, but class certification briefing would not be complete
 21 until later.

22

23

24 ¹⁵ The Altria Defendants position is the same as JLI's position. However, if the Court does give
 25 the plaintiffs the extension they request for class certification, the Altria Defendants respectfully
 26 submit that it would be practical and appropriate for the expert related and summary judgment
 27 deadlines in the class case to be extended by an identical amount.

28 ¹⁶ Plaintiffs' request to adjust the schedule as to only one part of only the class-action cases is
 29 inconsistent with their resistance to what they derided as a "siloing" or "balkanized approach" to
 30 scheduling. (ECF No. 927 at 2; *see also* ECF No. 910 at 5.) Indeed, it is unclear why Plaintiffs
 31 now request that the class certification motion deadline—which they described as one of "critical
 32 milestones in the litigation" (ECF No. 910 at 4)—be cleaved off and adjusted without similar
 33 modifications to the rest of the schedule.

1 *Third*, Plaintiffs’ pretextual reference to JLI production issues is neither necessary (JLI
2 does not oppose reasonable and fair extensions) nor accurate. Plaintiffs do not explain why JLI
3 sales data or ads are necessary to their class certification motion or to meet their burden on class
4 issues and damages. In any event, Plaintiffs’ characterizations are incomplete or incorrect.
5 Plaintiffs claim that JLI “recently produced thousands of advertisements that ran during the class
6 period.” While there was a supplemental production of ads on January 1, 2021, it is neither
7 surprising nor improper that additional productions have and will continue—and this particular
8 production was made six months before the June 18, 2021 deadline for the substantial completion
9 of fact discovery. (ECF No. 938 at 4.). Similarly, the claim that “only two weeks ago JLI made
10 its first productions of certain basic sales and cost information (e.g. financial reports showing
11 profits and costs) that plaintiffs have been actively pursuing since last summer” is incorrect.
12 Plaintiffs’ *September 14, 2020* deficiency letter raised specific issues with *produced* sales data,
13 such as JLI01504764.¹⁷ Plaintiffs have had substantial JLI sales information, and JLI has taken
14 extraordinary efforts to provide additional requested information, notwithstanding the substantial
15 burden imposed by those requests.¹⁸

17 In short, further briefing on Plaintiffs' new proposal would be appropriate, but if the Court
18 decides to resolve the issue now, it should move the entire schedule by six weeks or deny
19 Plaintiffs' request for more time.

22 ¹⁷ That document, which was produced in July 2020, identified a breakdown by month of: (1) the
23 number of each JUUL devices sold, (2) the number of JUULpods sold by e-liquid name/flavor,
24 (3) the number of other JUUL components and accessories, broken out by component or
25 accessory, and (4) the average revenue per unit for each JUULpod and device. Moreover, other
26 details were already produced long before the recent January productions. For instance, gross
revenue, profit, and cost information was produced last year. *See e.g.*, JLI01359458 (produced
6/24/2020), JLI01504764 (produced 7/28/2020), JLI10081007 (produced 7/23/2020),
JLI11175280 (produced 7/23/2020), JLI11790986 (produced 7/23/2020), JLI04612510 (produced
12/07/2020).

²⁷ For instance, JLI specially created for Plaintiffs a lookup table identifying the number of JUULpods and devices, with nicotine percentage, pod volume, and flavor, for over 200 stock-keeping units (SKUs). This table took significant time to complete and required input from people in different departments and cross references to multiple platforms.

1 C. Trial Mechanics

2 Plaintiffs have reached out to Defendants to discuss the following topics to prepare for the
 3 first set of bellwether trials:

- 4 1. Mini-opening statements before Voir Dire
- 5 2. Voir Dire by Counsel
- 6 3. Use of Jury Questionnaire
- 7 4. Hardship Qualifications
- 8 5. Method/order of selection (six-pack etc.)
- 9 6. Peremptory challenges
- 10 7. Use of Exhibits in Opening
- 11 8. Trial Binders or Tablets for Jurors
- 12 9. Procedure for Playing Video Designations
- 13 10. Trial time estimates
- 14 11. Mini-Summations during trial
- 15 12. Rule 42 Considerations – Bifurcation or Joinder of Claims and Cases

16 Plaintiffs suggested the parties confer to see where they can reach consensus, with the
 17 objective of discussing further with the Court at the March conference. Though Defendants have
 18 declined to discuss these matters, Plaintiffs (who disagree with Defendants' characterization of
 19 Plaintiffs' responses to ongoing discovery, the status of which is set out in the parties' February 5,
 20 2021 Joint Discovery Status Report attached as **Exhibit C**) remain prepared to address these
 21 issues.

22 Defendants appreciate the Court's sentiments that early discussions of trial procedures
 23 may be beneficial, but believe that at the present time the Parties' efforts are best focused on
 24 imminent discovery obligations. Defendants are concerned that Plaintiffs are struggling to
 25 respond to basic discovery that must be conducted now to meet the case schedule they have
 26 proposed. For example, Plaintiffs have missed deadlines without advance notice; and the
 27 Government Entity plaintiffs have yet to propose search terms, despite the fact that the ESI
 28 protocol places the initial burden on the producing party to do so. (ECF No. 323). Defendants

1 respectfully suggest that a discussion of the issues identified by Plaintiffs should occur and may
 2 be more productive after the close of fact discovery in June 2021, which is more than seven
 3 months before the scheduled first trial in February 2022.

4 **D. PSC Appointment**

5 Pursuant to the Court's appointment order, Co-Lead Counsel have the authority to
 6 appoint, without the Court's prior approval, members of the PSC or other counsel to do work as
 7 Co-Lead Counsel deem necessary to the effective and efficient management of this litigation.
 8 ECF No. 341. Co-Lead Counsel have used this authority to allocate substantial work to certain
 9 counsel, including Christopher Gold of Robbins Geller. Mr. Gold has resigned from Robbins
 10 Geller and will no longer be participating in the work of the JUUL PSC. In light of these
 11 developments and the work performed to date in the MDL by the Robbins Geller firm, and with
 12 the Court's approval, Co-Lead Counsel propose that Ms. Aelish Baig, a partner in Robbins
 13 Geller's San Francisco office, be formally be appointed by the Court to the PSC. Ms. Baig
 14 represents the City of Rochester, which was recently selected as a Wave 1 bellwether. In
 15 addition, Ms. Baig has significant experience representing government entities, including
 16 government entities undergoing discovery as bellwethers. Ms. Baig currently represents the City
 17 and County of San Francisco, one of the bellwethers in the National Opiates MDL that has been
 18 remanded for trial before Judge Breyer. Plaintiffs fully intend to meet the case schedule set forth
 19 by the Court, and Ms. Baig and her team will play a critical role in these efforts.

20 **V. DISCOVERY STATUS**

21 **A. MDL Discovery**

22 On February 9, 2021, the Parties participated in a discovery conference with Judge Corley.
 23 A copy of the February 5, 2021 Joint Discovery Status Report provided in advance of that
 24 conference is attached as **Exhibit C**. The parties will be prepared to update the Court regarding
 25 developments since that conference.

26 Plaintiffs seek to depose three former JLI employees who apparently live abroad. JLI has
 27 provided contact for their counsel, where applicable, as well as last known email addresses.
 28 Plaintiffs anticipate they may need to seek relief from this Court to issue subpoenas pursuant to

1 the Walsh Act (28 U.S.C § 1783(a)) and/or effect alternative service under Rule 4(f)(3).

2 Defendants reserve all rights regarding these efforts.

3 The MDL Plaintiffs are holding weekly calls with JCCP counsel regarding discovery
 4 coordination. Defendants appreciate and encourage coordination between the MDL and the JCCP,
 5 as detailed by the Joint Coordination Order (CMO No. 9, ECF No. 572) and the Deposition
 6 Protocol (CMO No. 10, ECF No. 573).

7 **B. Government Entity Discovery**

8 On January 20, 2021, pursuant to the Court's order, the Parties each identified six
 9 bellwethers that would comprise the twelve bellwether pool of government entities. ECF 1291,
 10 ECF 1292. Defendants served written discovery consisting of 11 interrogatories and 60 requests
 11 for production on all twelve bellwethers on January 21st. On January 27th the Parties submitted
 12 competing proposals for separating the bellwether pool into two waves, and on February 1st the
 13 Court selected the Wave 1 and Wave 2 bellwethers. ECF 1355. The Parties are in the process of
 14 meeting and conferring regarding this discovery, but request the Court's guidance on the
 15 following issues: (1) the appropriate response deadline for the Wave 1 discovery; and (2) the
 16 status of Wave 2 bellwether discovery.

17 **Plaintiffs' Position**

18 With respect to Wave 2 discovery, the Court's November 20, 2020 order regarding
 19 government entity bellwether selection provides that “[t]he discovery, trial preparation, and trial
 20 deadlines and dates for the cases in this pool shall be sequenced in a manner to be agreed to by
 21 the Parties and approved by the Court, or as ordered by the Court, with the pool divided into at
 22 least two subgroups for which the dates and deadlines for discovery, trial preparation, and trial
 23 shall be separated by at least nine months.” ECF 1157 (Nov. 20, 2020). As explained in the
 24 Parties' November Case Management Conference statement, the parties specifically agreed “that
 25 the sequencing and ordering of the bellwethers needs to occur *such that not all twelve bellwethers*
 26 *of the bellwethers are undergoing discovery and expert work up at the same time*. The Parties
 27 agree that as a general matter, a separation of nine months is appropriate between different groups
 28 drawn from the twelve bellwether cases.” ECF 1154 (Nov. 18, 2020) (emphasis added). This

1 agreement was repeated in both the December and January CMC statements. ECF 1191 (Dec. 16,
 2 2020), ECF 1266 (Jan. 13, 2021). Defendants' proposal to commence discovery of the Wave 2
 3 plaintiffs now is directly contrary to the Court's order and the Parties (repeated) agreement and
 4 essentially eliminates the rationale for having two waves in the first place: allowing the parties to
 5 focus on discovery and expert work of one wave at a time. Defendants' proposal to expand the
 6 number of entities undergoing discovery at once is particularly out of place given their claims that
 7 they do not have sufficient time for them to take adequate discovery of the Wave 1 government
 8 entity bellwether cases.

9 With respect to Wave 1 discovery, Plaintiffs' are working to review and respond to
 10 Defendants' discovery requests. However, Plaintiffs' position is that this discovery should be
 11 deemed served on February 2, immediately after the Court selected the Wave 1 and Wave 2
 12 bellwethers. This would set a deadline of March 4th (30 days after the discovery has been
 13 served), for responses and objections. Plaintiffs note that this is how Defendants have previously
 14 indicated they were going to proceed with respect to Wave 1 discovery. Defendants stated in the
 15 January Joint Case Management Statement that they "anticipate serving discovery promptly *after*
 16 the Wave 1 cases are designated." ECF 1266 at 5 (emphasis added). This approach is consistent
 17 with the Court's order, and the parties' agreement, that discovery was to be sequenced with Wave
 18 2 discovery occurring after Wave 1 discovery so that twelve government entity bellwethers were
 19 not undergoing discovery simultaneously. Defendants now contend that they anticipated
 20 discovery commencing on January 20th because the parties would simply decide amongst
 21 themselves what bellwethers would fall into Wave 1 and Wave 2. But this ignores that the
 22 Court's order specifically provided for competing proposals to be submitted on January 27th, a
 23 week after the initial pool was created. It also makes no sense for a public health department or a
 24 school district to start analyzing and responding to discovery requests for which there is no case
 25 schedule, let alone discovery deadlines. The fact that Defendants served discovery prematurely –
 26 almost two weeks before the Wave 1 bellwethers were selected by the Court, should not truncate
 27 Plaintiffs' time to respond. Plaintiffs also disagree that by submitting competing bellwether
 28 proposals to the Court and allowing the Court to decide on the composition of Wave 1 and Wave

1 2, Plaintiffs have somehow “delayed” the selection of Wave 1 bellwethers. In fact, it was
 2 Defendants that delayed the process by seeking to file reply briefs to the Parties’ bellwether
 3 sequencing proposals. Plaintiffs are working diligently to respond to Defendants’ discovery and
 4 are meeting and conferring with Defendants on this discovery in advance of serving their
 5 responses and objections. But given that Plaintiffs have repeatedly agreed to *extend* Defendants’
 6 time to respond to discovery, Defendants insistence on *shortening* Plaintiffs response time is
 7 inappropriate.¹⁹

8 **Defendants’ Position**

9 Defendants served requests for production and interrogatories on the twelve bellwether
 10 plaintiffs on January 21—the day after the bellwethers were selected. Defendants expect the
 11 Wave 1 plaintiffs to provide substantive responses to those requests by Monday, February 22.
 12 Defendants offered the Wave 2 plaintiffs a two-week extension for responses; plaintiffs rejected
 13 that offer because they believe there should be no Wave 2 discovery at all for the next nine
 14 months.

15 Plaintiffs’ position is untenable. As to discovery of Wave 1 bellwether plaintiffs, they
 16 seek a 10-day extension merely to provide written responses. They give no explanation for why
 17 they need such an extension (nor did they request an extension from Defendants), instead arguing
 18 that this Court has already held that discovery could not begin until after the 12 government entity
 19 bellwethers were allocated between Wave 1 and Wave 2. None of this Court’s Orders barred
 20 Defendants from serving discovery promptly after the twelve bellwethers were selected, and
 21 Plaintiffs cite none. Defendants indicated in the January CMC statement that they anticipated
 22 serving discovery promptly after the Wave 1 cases were selected, but in the same statement
 23 Defendants explained that they believed the parties should each designate three of their

24 ¹⁹ Plaintiffs note that JUUL took 62 days to respond to Plaintiffs’ First Requests for Production,
 25 and 80 days to respond to Plaintiffs First Set of Interrogatories (First Requests for Production
 26 served on March 17, 2020 and responded to on May 18, 2020; First Interrogatories Served on
 27 March 17, 2020 and responded to on June 5, 2020). JUUL took another 62 days to respond to
 28 Plaintiffs’ Second Requests for Production, and 113 days to respond to Plaintiffs Second Set of
 Interrogatories (Second Requests for Production served on March 26, 2020, and responded to on
 May 27, 2020; Second Set of Interrogatories served on March 26, 2020 and responded to on July
 17, 2020).

1 bellwether selections for Wave 1 on January 20. ECF 1266 at 5. In other words, Defendants'
 2 position anticipated that discovery on the bellwethers would commence when the parties each
 3 made their selections on January 20; and Defendants served discovery promptly after January 20.
 4 Plaintiffs successfully resisted Defendants' proposal that would have resulted in Wave 1 being
 5 determined on January 20, and thereby delayed the selection of the Wave 1 cases by 10 days.
 6 Notably, even though discovery had already been served by the time the Parties submitted their
 7 briefs on Wave 1 selection, Plaintiffs did not argue that discovery was stayed until the Court
 8 selected the Wave 1 cases. ECF 1337. To the contrary, Plaintiffs urged the Court to select their
 9 bellwether picks (which now account for 4 of the 6 Wave 1 cases) because doing so would allow
 10 cases to be ready for trial sooner. ECF 1349 at 2. Yet the first thing Plaintiffs have done is seek
 11 to grant themselves a unilateral discovery extension.

12 The discovery period for the government entity bellwethers is already extremely brief;
 13 government entity fact discovery opened on either January 20 (Defendants' position) or February
 14 2 (Plaintiffs' position) and is scheduled to close on June 18, 2021, a mere four months from now.
 15 Defendants believe that the allotted time of four and one-half or five months (depending on the
 16 start date) is not sufficient time for them to take adequate discovery of the Wave 1 government
 17 entity bellwether cases, but to date the Court has concluded otherwise.²⁰ Setting aside for now
 18 that difference in view, there is no reason to truncate the already-short time period by ten days
 19 (~7%) by delaying the very first step of the discovery process. The Court should require Wave 1
 20 Plaintiffs to respond to written discovery by February 22.²¹

21
 22 ²⁰ By comparison, Plaintiffs have already taken discovery of JLI for more than 60 weeks, and
 23 have another 17 weeks to go.

24 ²¹ Defendants note that the government entity bellwethers are delaying discovery in a number of
 25 other respects. They have not yet provided a list of ESI search terms, although required to do so
 26 by the ESI Order (ECF 323), instead promising to do so by the end of the day on February 19.
 27 They have also declined to provide proposed custodians until February 26. These delays will
 28 leave no time for depositions, a process the bellwethers are similarly delaying. They have not yet
 provided any proposed dates for the 30(b)(6) depositions that were noticed on February 2 and
 have suggested that those depositions must either be delayed until document discovery is
 substantially complete, or proceed without documents. It is inconceivable that there will be
 substantial completion of the production of documents by the Wave 1 government entity
 bellwethers for many months or that depositions can be completed by the present discovery
 cutoff.

1 As to Wave 2 bellwethers, Defendants do not believe it makes sense to suspend all
 2 discovery for nine months. Defendants recognize that Wave 2 discovery does not need to
 3 proceed at the same pace as Wave 1 discovery. That is why Defendants offered an extension on
 4 written discovery responses and have not yet noticed Wave 2 depositions. A complete, nine-
 5 month stay until the *commencement* of Wave 2 discovery will, however, result in an
 6 extraordinarily and unnecessarily truncated Wave 2 discovery period. There is no reason that
 7 Wave 2 Plaintiffs cannot respond to discovery over the next nine months, even if they do so on a
 8 slower schedule than the Wave 1 Plaintiffs. Requiring these Plaintiffs to do so will ensure that the
 9 Wave 2 cases move forward efficiently towards eventual trial. The Court should permit Wave 2
 10 discovery to proceed while recognizing, as Defendants do, that discovery in the Wave 2 cases is
 11 less urgent than Wave 1 discovery.

12 **C. Class Representative Discovery**

13 The bellwether class plaintiffs have served amended responses to Defendants' discovery
 14 requests, and the parties are meeting and conferring concerning those responses. ESI has been
 15 collected from each of the Class Representatives for the class bellwether proceedings, and the
 16 parties recently reached agreement on the search terms. Plaintiffs are in the process of running
 17 those search terms and reviewing the responsive documents. Plaintiffs have nearly completed the
 18 submission of Plaintiff Fact Sheets, and the remainder is in the process of being completed.

19 The parties have reached agreement on a Plaintiff Fact Sheet Implementation Order
 20 applicable to the Non-Bellwether Class Representatives that is similar to those entered the Court
 21 with respect to the submission of Plaintiff Fact Sheets by personal injury plaintiffs (CMO No. 8,
 22 ECF No. 406); and government entities (CMO No. 13, ECF No. 1075), except for one issue on
 23 which the parties seek the Court's guidance. The parties disagree as to whether the provision
 24 allowing Defendants to move to convert a dismissal without prejudice to a dismissal with
 25 prejudice should be included in this PFS Order. (Attached hereto as **Exhibit D** is a draft of the
 26 Proposed Non-Bellwether Class Representative Fact Sheet Implementation Order, which is
 27 agreed to with the exception of the highlighted portion on page 5.)

28

1 **Plaintiffs' Position**

2 Plaintiffs agree that if a non-bellwether class representative fails to serve a Plaintiff Fact
 3 Sheet by the applicable deadlines and does not cure that deficiency, that individual's claim should
 4 be dismissed without prejudice. There is, however, no basis for preventing that individual from
 5 recovering as an absent class member in any settlement or judgment that may eventually occur.
 6 There is, of course, no requirement that absent class members participate in discovery as
 7 prerequisite to receiving a portion of any class action settlement or judgment. It thus follows that
 8 to the extent an individual does not comply with discovery obligations that arise only by virtue of
 9 filing a complaint and serving as a class representative, the appropriate sanction is to dismiss that
 10 person's complaint and prevent him or her from serving as a class representative. It does not
 11 follow that there should be the additional punishment of preventing that person from recovering
 12 as an absent class member at all, and putting that person in a worse position than she would have
 13 been in had she never filed a complaint in the first place.

14 **Defendants' Position**

15 The Court should not depart from the motion-to-dismiss procedure that it has twice
 16 considered and adopted in the Personal Injury and Government Entity PFS Orders. (CMO Nos. 8,
 17 13; ECF Nos. 406, 1075.) Both Orders provide that, if—after the generous time periods for
 18 compliance, notification procedures, and opportunities to cure—a party plaintiff has not complied
 19 with the Court ordered PFS deadlines, then Defendants may move to convert the dismissal
 20 without prejudice to a dismissal with prejudice. The same process should be available here for
 21 the following reasons.

22 *First*, regardless of whether absent class members are required to respond to discovery,
 23 class representatives are not absent class members. They are named party plaintiffs who would
 24 be subject to this provision only if they repeatedly violated Court discovery orders that are
 25 applicable to them. As Judge Corley observed in response to the Parties' request for informal
 26 guidance on this issue, a plaintiff who still wants to be a class representative has a choice: he or
 27 she can "just stand back and be an absentee class member," but if he or she chooses to be a
 28 representative "you have to complete this information; and if you don't your claims . . . all may

1 be dismissed with prejudice.” (2/9/21 Conf. Tr. at 11) Moreover, any named plaintiff who may
 2 be subject to a motion to convert a dismissal from one without prejudice to one with prejudice
 3 will have had abundant time to submit a PFS (which, as Plaintiffs note above, does not even
 4 require documents or signed records authorizations) before the provision would potentially apply.
 5 In particular, by the time Defendants could even first **move** to convert to a dismissal with
 6 prejudice, that plaintiff would not have submitted a complete PFS even though:

- 7 • more than **three months** will have elapsed after the expected entry of the PFS Order;
- 8 • more than **seven months** will have elapsed after the parties reached an agreement on the
 PFS form in October 2020 and Plaintiffs’ counsel had indicated their clients were
 completing the PFSs; and
- 9 • more than **one year** will have elapsed since these class representatives were included on
 the Amended Consolidated Class Action complaint filed on March 11, 2020.

10 *Second*, we now know that the process works. In connection with the personal injury PFS
 11 Order (CMO No. 8), the Court recently commented that this procedure for dismissals with
 12 prejudice “made a lot of sense.” (1/15/2021 Hr’g Tr. at 6:19-20.) In particular, the Court
 13 considered JLI’s motions to convert dismissals of 95 plaintiffs from without prejudice to with
 14 prejudice under CMO No. 8. (See ECF Nos. 1167, 1169.) The Court then afforded those subject
 15 plaintiffs another 30 days to submit their PFS or face dismissal with prejudice, noting “these
 16 lawsuits were filed for people, and the defendants are producing billions of pieces of paper in this
 17 case, and if somebody wants to participate they need to step up now.” (1/15/2021 Hr’g Tr. at
 18 6:12-20; *see also* ECF No. 1277 (“the Court will dismiss with prejudice all cases identified in
 19 Exhibit A of the motions (‘covered-plaintiffs’), if those covered-plaintiffs have not filed plaintiff
 20 fact sheets on or before **February 16, 2021**. This is the last notice the covered-plaintiffs will get
 21 before dismissal with prejudice will be entered.”).)

22 *Third*, as Judge Corley recognized in connection with the PFS Order on Government
 23 Entity cases, “[t]he inclusion of this provision does not in any way reduce or mitigate Defendants’
 24 burden in proving to the Court that a dismissal with prejudice is warranted under whatever statute,
 25 rule or caselaw Defendants bring their motion.” (ECF No. 1038 at 4; *see also* 10/7/2020 Hr’g Tr.
 26 at 31:4-11).

1 Defendants thus respectfully request the Court adopt the same dismissal-with-prejudice
2 procedure with respect to the Class Action PFSs as provided in CMO Nos. 8 and 13.

3 **VI. ADR STATUS**

4 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-10(d), the Parties report that they continue to confer with
5 Settlement Master Thomas J. Perrelli and cooperate with his recommendations.

6 Dated: February 17, 2021

7 Respectfully submitted,

8 By: /s/ Renee D. Smith

9 Renee D. Smith (*pro hac vice*)
10 James F. Hurst (*pro hac vice*)
11 **KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**
12 300 N. LaSalle
Chicago, IL 60654
Telephone: (312) 862-2310

13 Sarah R. London
14 **LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &**
BERNSTEIN
15 275 Battery Street, Fl. 29
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 956-1000

16 By: /s/ Peter A. Farrell

17 Peter A. Farrell (*pro hac vice*)
18 **KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**
19 1301 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 389-5959

20 Dena C. Sharp
21 **GIRARD SHARP LLP**
22 601 California St., Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 981-4800

23 By: /s/ Gregory P. Stone

24 Gregory P Stone, SBN 78329
Bethany W. Kristovich, SBN 241891
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
350 South Grand Avenue
Fiftieth Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071-3426
Telephone: (213) 683-9100

25 Dean Kawamoto
26 **KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.**
27 1201 Third Ave., Ste. 3200
Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone: (206) 623-1900

28 *Attorneys for Defendant Juul Labs, Inc.*

By: /s/ Ellen Relkin

Ellen Relkin
WEITZ & LUXENBERG
700 Broadway
New York, NY 10003
Telephone: (212) 558-5500

Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs

1
2 By: /s/ John C. Massaro

3 **ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER
4 LLP**

5 John C. Massaro (admitted pro hac vice)
6 Jason A. Ross (admitted pro hac vice)
7 601 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
8 Washington D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 942-5000
Facsimile: (202) 942-5999
john.massaro@arnoldporter.com
Jason.ross@arnoldporter.com

9 *Attorneys for Defendants Altria Group, Inc.
10 and Philip Morris USA Inc.*

11 By: /s/ Eugene Illovsy

12 **BOERSCH & ILLOVSKY LLP**

13 Eugene Illovsy
14 Martha Boersch
15 Matthew Dirkes
16 1611 Telegraph Ave., Suite 806
Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (415) 500-6643
eugene@boersch-illovsy.com
martha@boersch-illovsy.com
matt@boersch-illovsy.com

17 *Attorneys for Defendant Adam Bowen*

18 By: /s/ James Kramer

19 **ORRICK HERRINGTON &
20 SUTCLIFFE LLP**

21 James Kramer
22 James Thompson
23 The Orrick Building
24 405 Howard Street
25 San Francisco, CA 94105-2669
26 Telephone: (415) 773-5700
jthompson@orrick.com
jkramer@orrick.com

27 *Attorneys for Defendant James Monsees*

28 By: /s/ Michael J. Guzman

29 **KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD, FIGEL &
30 FREDERICK, P.L.L.C.**

31 Mark C. Hansen
32 Michael J. Guzman
33 David L. Schwartz
34 Sumner Square, 1615 M St., N.W., Suite 400
35 Washington, DC 20036
36 Telephone: (202) 326-7910
37 mguzman@kellogghansen.com

38 *Attorneys for Defendants Nicholas Pritzker,
39 Riaz Valani, and Hoyoung Huh*

1 By: /s/ Mitchell B. Malachowski

2 **TYSON & MENDES, LLP**

3 James E. Sell
4 Mitchell B. Malachowski
Stephen Budica
April M. Cristal
5 523 4th Street, Suite 100
San Rafael, CA 94901
6 Telephone: (628) 253-5070
jsell@tysonmendes.com
7 mmalachowski@tysonmendes.com
sbudica@tysonmendes.com
8 acristal@tysonmendes.com

9 *Attorneys for Defendants Mother Murphy's
Labs, Inc., and Alternative Ingredients, Inc.*

10 By: /s/ Michael L. O'Donnell

11 **WHEELER TRIGG O'DONNELL LLP**

12 Michael L. O'Donnell
13 James E. Hooper
14 Marissa Ronk
15 370 17th Street, Ste. 4500
Denver, CO 80202
16 Telephone: (303) 244-1850
Odonnell@wtotrial.com
17 hooper@wtotrial.com
Ronk@wtotrial.com

18 *Attorneys for Defendant McLane Company,
Inc.*

19 By: /s/ David R. Singh

20 **WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP**

21 David R. Singh
22 Bambo Obaro
23 201 Redwood Shores Parkway, 6th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
24 Telephone: (650) 802-3083
25 david.singh@weil.com
bambo.obaro@weil.com

26 *Attorneys for Defendant Core-Mark Holding
Company, Inc.*

27 By: /s/ Robert Scher

28 **FOLEY & LARDNER LLP**

29 Robert Scher
Peter N. Wang
Graham D. Welch
Dyana K. Mardon
30 90 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016-1314
Telephone: (212) 682-7474
Facsimile: (212) 687-2329
rscher@foley.com
pwang@foley.com
gwelch@foley.com
dmardon@foley.com

31 *Attorney for Defendants Tobacco
Technology, Inc., and Eliquitech, Inc.*

32 By: /s/ Christopher J. Esbrook

33 **ESBROOK LAW P.C.**

34 Christopher J. Esbrook
35 David F. Pustilnik
36 Michael S. Kozlowski
37 77 W. Wacker, Suite 4500
Chicago, IL 60601
38 Telephone: (312) 319-7681
christopher.esbrook@esbrooklaw.com
david.pustilnik@esbrooklaw.com
michael.kozlowski@esbrooklaw.com

39 *Attorneys for Defendants Eby-Brown
Company, LLC, Circle K Stores, and 7-
Eleven, Inc., Speedway, and Walgreen Co.*

1 By: */s/ Donald F. Zimmer, Jr.*

2 **KING & SPALDING LLP**

3 Donald F. Zimmer, Jr.
4 Quyen L. Ta
5 Jennifer T. Stewart
6 101 Second Street, Suite 1000
7 San Francisco, CA 94105
8 Telephone: (415) 318-1200
9 fzimmer@kslaw.com
qta@kslaw.com
jstewart@kslaw.com

10 *Attorneys for Defendant Walmart Inc.*

11 By: */s/ Charles C. Correll Jr.*

12 **KING & SPALDING LLP**

13 Andrew T. Bayman (Admitted pro hac vice)
14 1180 Peachtree Street, Suite 1600
15 Atlanta, GA 30309
16 Telephone: (404) 572-4600
17 abayman@kslaw.com

18 and

19 Charles C. Correll, Jr.
20 Matthew J. Blaschke
21 Alessandra M. Givens
22 101 Second Street, Suite 2300
23 San Francisco, CA 94105
24 Telephone: (415) 318-1200
25 ccorrell@kslaw.com
26 mblaschke@kslaw.com
27 agivens@kslaw.com

28 *Attorneys for Defendant Chevron Corporation*